

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/658,904	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAPELLER-LIBERMANN, ROSANA	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maryam Monshipouri	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656	

**All Participants:**

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(2) Ms. T.M. Sioussat.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 14 March 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

29-34

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner requested authority to cancel withdrawn claims 29-34. Ms. Sioussat indicated that said claims should be rejoined with the elected invention. In response the examiner mentioned that said claims are not directed to a method of use of an isolated polypeptide and have therefore, a different scope than the allowed product. Finally, it was mutually agreed to cancel the withdrawn claims in an examiner's amendment.